arXiv:1010.3371v1 [math.GM] 16 Oct 2010

American Mathematical Monthly
Volume 4?5, Number 7?, ?2012

ANALYTIC IMPLICATIONS FROM THE REMAINDER TERM OF THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM

CHENG, YUAN-YOU FU-RUI AND FOX, GLENN

Dedicated to Carl B. Pomerance on the occasion of his 68th birthday

1. Introduction

It is well known that prime numbers play a central role in number theory. It has been known, since Riemann's famous memoir in 1860, that the distribution of prime numbers can be described by the zero-free region of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$. This function is a meromorphic function of the complex variable s. It has infinitely many zeros and a unique pole at $s = 1$ with the residue 1. It is customary to denote $s = \sigma + it$. For $\sigma > 1$, the Riemann zeta fucntion can be defined by

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p^s}}, \tag{1.1}$$

with the second equlity as above being Euler's identity. One may verify Euler's identity from fundamental theorem of arithmetic, which asserts

$$n = \prod_{j=1}^{k} p_j^{a_j} \tag{1.2}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $p_j^{a_j} \in \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}$. It is extended to a meromorphic function by analytic continuation. By logarithmic differentiation of Euler's identity, one gets

$$-\frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n) - 1}{n^s}. \tag{1.3}$$

Received by the editors December 10, 2010.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11N05, 11M26, 32A60.
We would like to thank Andrew M. Odlyzko for his helpful comments. Also, we wish to thank the reviewers for their careful reading.

©?2010 The American Mathematical Society

Those zeros at $s = -2, -4, -6, \ldots$ are called trivial zeros. Nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are located in the so-called critical strip $0 \le \sigma \le 1$.

Throughout this article, we shall use notations $\mathbb{P}$ for the set of all prime numbers, $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}$ that of the all prime powers, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ that of natural numbers, $\mathbb{R}$ that of the real numbers, and $\mathbb{C}$ that of the complex numbers. We also use the notation $\mathbb{R}^+$ for the set of all positive real numbers. We shall use the symbol $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for an arbitrary small positive real number, not necessarily the same at each occurrence in a given statement. Suppose that $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ are complex functions of the variable x and $f(y)$ is a positive real-valued function of y. The notation $g(x) = h(x) + O\big(f(y)\big)$ represents the fact that $|g(x) - h(x)| \le Bf(y)$ with some absolute sconstant $B > 0$ whenever y is sufficiently large or $y \ge y_0$ for some fixed positive number y_0. For convenience, we also use the notation $f(x) = h(x) \lhd g(y)$ for the statement $|f(x) - h(x)| \le |g(y)|$. The notations C, C_1, C_2, $\ldots$ denote suitable absolute positive constants, and $C(x)$ denotes the positive constant dependent on x, whatevery x represents for.

It is not very difficult to show that nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are located in the strip $0 < \sigma < 1$. Other results in this direction are zero-free regions in the form of

$$\sigma > 1 - h(t), \qquad |t| > 3, \tag{1.4}$$

where $h(t)$ with $1/2 \le \sigma < 1$ is a decreasing function of t. This function $h(t)$ may be $\frac{C}{\log|t|}$, $\frac{C \log\log|t|}{\log|t|}$, or $\frac{C}{\log^{2/3}|t|}$. See any standard literature, or [5] and [7].

Define Dirichlet's symbol as the following arithmetic function

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \log p, & n \in \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}, \\ 0, & n \in \mathbb{N}/\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{N}}. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Let $x \ge 2$. We define ψ-function, as in the literature, and ϖ are defined by

$$\psi(x) = \ominus\!\!\!\!\!\!\sum_{n \le x} \Lambda(n), \qquad \varpi(x) = \ominus\!\!\!\!\!\!\sum_{n \le x} \big(\Lambda(n) - 1\big), \tag{1.6}$$

where n is running through the set of positive integers not greater than x. The notation $\ominus\!\!\!\!\!\!\sum_{n \le x} f(n)$ means that we adopt half-maximum convention to the sum function of the arithmetic function $f(n)$. Therefore, $\psi(x_0) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\lim_{x \to x_0-} \psi(x) + \lim_{x \to x_0+} \psi(x)\big)$. The similar is valid for $\varpi(x)$.

It is well known that zero-free region of $\zeta(s)$, in the form of $\sigma > h(t)$ and $|t| \ge 3$, implies the prime number theorem in the following equivalent ψ-form and ϖ-form:

$$\psi(x) = x + O\big(x^{1-H(x)} \log^2 x\big), \quad \varpi(x) \lhd B\big(x^{1-H(x)} \log^2 x\big), \tag{1.7}$$

with an absolute constant B, where the function $H(x)$ is connected to $h(t)$ in a certain way. Less known is that the converse is also true. Actually, Turán proved in 1950 that the above ψ-form of the prime number theorem with $H(x) =$??? implies the above zero-free region of $\zeta(s)$ with $h(t) =$???. See [7] and [16].

Corresponding to the definition of $\varpi(x)$ in (1.6) and the estimate on $\varpi(x)$ in (1.7), we study the function

$$\mathcal{Z}(s) = -\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} - \zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n) - 1}{n^s}. \tag{1.8}$$

The series in (1.8) is convergent when $\sigma > 1$. For $\sigma > 0$, we have

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{s}{s-1} - s\int_1^{\infty} \frac{v - \lfloor v \rfloor}{v^{s+1}} \, \mathrm{d}\, v, \quad \text{for } \sigma > 0, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\lfloor v \rfloor$ is the integer part of v or the greatest integer less than or equal to v. One may notice that $s = 1$ is a pole for $\zeta(s)$ having residue 1. It is well known that

$$-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{s-1} - \sum_{\rho \in \mathsf{Z}} \Big(\frac{1}{s-\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho}\Big) + \frac{\Gamma'\big(\frac{1}{2}s + 1\big)}{2\Gamma\big(\frac{1}{2}s + 1\big)} + 1 + \frac{\gamma_0}{2} - \log \pi - \log 2. \tag{1.10}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ is the set of nontrivial zeros for the Riemann zeta function and $\gamma_0 \approx 0.577215$ is the Euler constant. The function $\Gamma(s)$ has neither zero nor pole for $\sigma > 1$. Note that the pole of $-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$ and $\zeta(s)$ at $s = 1$ is canceled. The set $\mathbf{Z}$ is the same as the set of other poles for the function $-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$.

Henceforth, we let $\theta \geq 2$ be a fixed constant and denote

$$H_j(x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{(3.1 + j/8) \log\log x}{\log x}, & x > x_j, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & 2 < x \leq x_j, \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

and

$$h_j(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{(3.1 + j/8)\theta \log t}{t^{\theta}}, & t > t_j, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & 0 < t \leq t_j, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

where

$$x_j = \max_{x > e} \big\{(3.1 + j/8) \log\log x = \log x\big\}, \tag{1.13}$$

and

$$t_j = \max\Big\{29753, \max_{t>1}\big\{(3.1 + j/8)\theta \log t = t^{\theta}\big\}\Big\}, \tag{1.14}$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N} - 1$.

It is obvious that $x_j > x_{j-1}$ and $H_j(x) \geq H_{j-1}(x)$ for $x > x_j$.

Xavier Gourdon uses an optimization of Odlyzko and Schönhage algorithm in [10] and has verified in [6] the 10^{13} first zeros of the Riemann zeta function in 2004 is simple and located on $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. But, we shall only use the fact that there are no zeros for the Riemann zeta function for $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ and $|t| \leq 29753$, which is verified in [9] by Meller in 1958.

For our application in [3], we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $H_j(x)$ is suitable for*

$$\varpi(x) \lhd Bx^{1-H_j(x)} \log^2 x \tag{1.15}$$

to be valid for a $j \in \{0\} \cap \mathbb{N}$. constant θ, we have both the functions $\mathcal{Z}(s)$ and $\zeta(s)$ are regular and $\zeta(s)$ do not vanish when $\sigma > 1 - h_j(t)$.

In iterm (ii), our zero-free region is wider than Turán's in [16] when j is sufficiently large. The items (i) and (ii) of Main Theorem are equivalent. It is straightforward to see that the item (i) of Main Theorem implies the iterm (ii) of that. To the contrary we assume that there were a zero ρ in the region $\sigma > 1 - h_j(t)$. It would follow from (1.10) that $-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$ has a pole in the same region. By the definition (1.8) with (1.9) and (1.10), one sees that the function $\mathcal{Z}(s)$ would have a pole for $\sigma > h_j(t)$, which contradicts the convergence of the series in In order to prove the iterm (i) and (ii) of Main Theorem, we first prove that the iterm (ii) of Main Theorem implies the item (i) of that and then prove that the iterm (ii) of Main Theorem. After that, we prove the iterm (iii) of Main Theorem.

2. Proof of the Main Theorem

First, we show the Main Theorem by contradiction. We denote $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ henceforth. Assume to the contrary that there is a nontrivial zero

$$\rho' = \beta' + i\gamma' \tag{2.1}$$

of $\zeta(s)$ such that

$$\gamma' > t_j \quad \text{and} \quad \beta' > 1 - h(\gamma'). \tag{2.2}$$

From now on, we let δ be a constant such that $\frac{1}{2} < \delta \leq 1$ with the value of δ being determined at the end of Section 5. Also, let a, b, c,

u, x, y, and λ be constants such that $a > 1$, $0 < c < b < \log\gamma'/4$, $c(\log a - \log(a-1)) < 1$, $u > 0$, $x > \max\{2, ua(1-\beta')\}$, $y > 1$, and $\lambda > 0$ whose values will be determined in Section 5 with respect to the two cases: (i) $\frac{1}{2} < \beta' \le \delta$; (ii) $\delta < \beta' \le 1$.

We let

$$\sigma_0 = a - (a-1)\beta' \quad \textit{and} \quad s_0 = \sigma_0 + \gamma'. \tag{2.3}$$

We choose $\theta \ge 3$ to be a fixed real number such that

$$(\gamma')^{\theta} \ge . \tag{2.4}$$

Then, we let

$$\omega = \frac{(\gamma')^{\theta}}{19.328(3.1+j/8)\theta\log\gamma'}, \quad \textit{and} \quad W = e^{k\omega}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$b\log\gamma' \ \le k \le c \ \log\gamma'. \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore,

$$\log W \ge \tag{2.7}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} W &\ge \max\Big\{(2W)^{1/2}, \log^{?(3.1+j/8)}(2W)\Big\} \\ &= \frac{(2W)^{H(2W)}}{\log^2(2W)} \ge \frac{\gamma'(B\gamma'+4B)}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

By the argument in Section 3 and 4, we show that

$$S = \sum_{\rho\in\mathbf{H}} \left(e^{\omega(\rho-\rho')}\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-\rho}\right)^k \lhd \frac{7297\ W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\iota}}, \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\mathbf{H} = \Big\{\rho\in\mathbf{Z} : |\gamma-\gamma'| \le u(\sigma_0-\beta') \quad \text{and} \quad \beta > 1-x(\sigma_0-\beta')\Big\}. \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$\iota = \min\{\tau, \tau', 1, \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3\}, \tag{2.11}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau \ = 1 - c(\log a - \log(a-1)), \quad \tau' = c(\log a - \log(a-1)), \\ &\tau_1 = b(\log x - \log 2), \qquad \tau_3 = b\log y, \\ &\tau_2 = b(\log(ua) - (\log a - \log(a-1))) - \tau^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Here $\tau^{(0)} = \log\log T_0/\log T_0 < 1/8$ or $1/4$ if good enough.

In Section 5, we use the estimate in (2.9), apply a lemma from Turán's power sum method, and acquire

$$|S| \geq \frac{1}{(\gamma')^{\kappa}}, \tag{2.13}$$

with

$$\kappa = \min\begin{cases} \frac{21\,a\,(1-\delta)}{22}(4\log 2 + 2 + \log(1+\lambda)), \\ \frac{21\,a}{44}\,(1 + \log(1+\lambda) + \log(1+1/M'')), \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

in which,

$$M'' = \frac{a(1-\delta)}{\sqrt{((a-1)(1-\delta)+1/2)^2 + u^2a^2(1-\delta)^2}}. \tag{2.15}$$

With suitable choices of the above-mentioned constants at the end of Section 5, we get

$$0 < \kappa \leq \iota - \tfrac{1}{32}. \tag{2.16}$$

From (2.9) and (2.13), we reach

$$\beta' < 1 - \frac{(3.1 + j/8)\theta \log \gamma'}{\left(\gamma'\right)^{\theta}}, \tag{2.17}$$

which is a contradiction to (2.2). Therefore, the proof of item (ii) of Main Theorem is finished.

3. Implication from the Remainder

Concerning (2.9), we prove the following estimate

(3.1)
$$\left|\frac{W^{1-s}}{(s-1)^k} - \sum_{\rho\in\mathbf{Z}} \frac{W^{\rho-s}}{(s-\rho)^k} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{W^{-2n-s}}{(s+2n)^k}\right| \leq \frac{9\;2^{\sigma-1}\;W^{1-\sigma}}{2\,t\big(2^{\sigma-1}-1\big)(\sigma-1)^{k-1}},$$

for $\sigma > 1$, under the assumption (1.15).

We shall use the following lemma, which is from [15].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^+\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}+3$.*

(3.2)
$$\sum_{n>W} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s} \log^{k-1}\frac{n}{W}$$
$$= (k-1)!\bigg(\frac{W^{1-s}}{(s-1)^k} - \sum_{\rho\in\mathbf{Z}} \frac{W^{\rho-s}}{(s-\rho)^k} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{W^{-2n-s}}{(s+2n)^k}\bigg).$$

To apply Lemma 3.1, we consider

$$F_W(s) = \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s} \lhd \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |G_j(s)|, \tag{3.3}$$

where $N = \lfloor W \rfloor + 1$ and

$$G_j(s) = \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $N_j = 2^{j-1}N$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying the partial summation method, one sees

$$\begin{aligned} G_j(it) &= \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} \frac{\psi(n) - \psi(n-1)}{n^{it}} \\ &= -\frac{\psi(N_j - 1)}{N_j^{it}} + \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} \psi(n)\left(\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\right) + \frac{\psi(N_{j+1}-1)}{N_{j+1}^{it}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the assumsption (1.15) in item (ii) of Main Theorem or its equivalence – the first equation in (1.7). It results

$$\begin{aligned} G_j(it) \lhd &-\frac{N_j - 1}{N_j^{it}} + \frac{N_{j+1} - 1}{N_{j+1}^{it}} + \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} n\left(\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\right) \\ &+ 2BN_{j+1}^{1-H(N_{j+1})} \log^2 N_{j+1} + B \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} n^{1-H(n)} \log^2 n \left|\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\right|, \end{aligned}$$

since $H(x)$ is a decreasing function of x. The sum of the first three terms in the last expression is equal to $\sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} \frac{1}{n^{it}}$ by the partial summation method. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} G_j(it) \lhd &\sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} \frac{1}{n^{it}} + 2BN_{j+1}^{1-H(N_{j+1})} \log^2 N_{j+1} \\ &+ BN_{j+1}^{-H(N_{j+1})} \log^2 N_{j+1} \sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} n \left|\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

We now estimate the first sum in (3.5). From $|e^z - 1 - z| \le |z|^2$ when $\Re(z) \le 1$ and $|\log(1+u) - u| \le \frac{1}{2}u^2$ and $\log(1+u) \le u$ when

$0 < u < 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \big|(n+1)^{1-it} - n^{1-it} - (1-it)n^{-it}\big| &= n\Big|\big(1+\tfrac{1}{n}\big)^{1-it} - 1 - \tfrac{1-it}{n}\Big| \\ \le n\Big|\big(1+\tfrac{1}{n}\big)^{1-it} - 1 - (1-it)\log\big(1+\tfrac{1}{n}\big)\Big| &+ n|1-it|\Big|\log\big(1+\tfrac{1}{n}\big) - \tfrac{1}{n}\Big| \\ \le n\big(t^2+1\big)\log^2\big(1+\tfrac{1}{n}\big) &+ \tfrac{\sqrt{t^2+1}}{2n} \le \tfrac{9(t^2+1)}{8n}, \end{aligned}$$

with $z = (1-it)\log(1+\frac{1}{n})$ and $u = \frac{1}{n}$ for $t \ge 15$. Summarizing the last inequality from $n = N_j$ to $N_{j+1}-1$, we acquire

$$\left|N_{j+1}^{1-it} - N_j^{1-it} - (1-it)\sum_{n=N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1}\frac{1}{n^{it}}\right| < \frac{9(t^2+1)}{8}.$$

It follows that

$$\left|\sum_{n=X_j}^{X_{j+1}-1}\frac{1}{n^{it}}\right| \le \frac{9\sqrt{t^2+1}}{8} + \frac{3N_j}{\sqrt{t^2+1}} < \frac{2N_{j+1}}{t}, \tag{3.6}$$

since $N > W \ge \frac{9(t^2+1)}{8}$ from (2.8).

As for the last sum in (3.5), we note

$$\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}} = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\left(\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)^{it} - 1\right) = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\left(e^{it\log(1+\frac{1}{n})} - 1\right).$$

We apply the mean value theorem to the difference in the last expression, getting $e^{it\log(1+\frac{1}{n})} - 1 = it\log\big(1+\frac{1}{n}\big)e^{im}$ with $0 < m \le t\log(1+\frac{1}{n})$. Note again that $\log(1+u) \le u$ for $0 < u < 1$. Hence,

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^{it}} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^{it}}\right| \le \frac{t}{n}. \tag{3.7}$$

Putting (3.6) and (3.7) in (3.5), we obtain

$$\big|G_j(it)\big| \le \frac{2N_{j+1}}{t} + \left(\frac{Bt}{2} + 2B\right)N_{j+1}^{1-H(N_{j+1})}\ \log^2 N_{j+1} \le \frac{9\cdot 2^{j-2}N}{t}, \tag{3.8}$$

recalling (2.8) with γ' being replaced by t. It follows that

$$G_j(s) = \sum_{n=2^{j-1}N}^{2^jN-1}\frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^{\sigma+it}} \lhd \frac{1}{(2^{j-1}N)^{\sigma}}G_j(it) \le \frac{9}{2\,t\ 2^{(\sigma-1)(j-1)}\ N^{\sigma-1}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Recalling (3.3), we acquire

$$|F_W(s)| \le \frac{9}{2tN^{\sigma-1}}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}2^{-(\sigma-1)(j-1)} = \frac{9\ 2^{\sigma-1}}{2t\big(2^{\sigma-1}-1\big)N^{\sigma-1}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Now, we state the following lemma from the context in [16].

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $W \in \mathbb{R}^+ \backslash \mathbb{Q}$ *and* $k \in \mathbb{N}+3$*.*

$$\sum_{n \geq W} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s} \log^{k-1} \frac{n}{W} = (k-1) \int_W^\infty F_u(s) \frac{\log^{k-2} \frac{u}{W}}{u} \, \mathrm{d}\, u. \tag{3.11}$$

From (3.10) and (3.11), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{n \geq W} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s} \log^{k-1} \frac{n}{W} \right| \leq \frac{9(k-1)2^{\sigma-1}}{2\,t(2^{\sigma-1}-1)} \int_W^\infty \frac{\log^{k-2} \frac{u}{W}}{u^\sigma} \, \mathrm{d}\, u \\ &= \frac{9(k-1)2^{\sigma-1}W^{1-\sigma}}{2\,t(2^{\sigma-1}-1)} \int_0^\infty \frac{v^{k-2}}{e^{v(\sigma-1)}} \, \mathrm{d}\, v = \frac{9(k-1)!\; 2^{\sigma-1}\; W^{1-\sigma}}{2\,t\big(2^{\sigma-1}-1\big)(\sigma-1)^{k-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

By Lemma 3.1, one obtains (3.1). Replacing s by s_0 and mutliplying (3.1) by $W(s_0)$ where $W(s_0) = W^{s_0-\rho'}(s_0-\rho')^k$, with $|W(s_0)| = W^{\sigma_0-\beta'}(\sigma_0-\beta')^k$, we acquire

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1-\rho'}\big(\tfrac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-1}\big)^k - \sum_{\rho \in \mathbf{Z}} W^{\rho-\rho'}\big(\tfrac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-\rho}\big)^k - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} W^{-2n-\rho'}\big(\tfrac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0+2n}\big)^k \\ \lhd \tfrac{9\ (\sigma-1)2^{\sigma-1}W^{1-\beta'}}{2(2^{\sigma-1}-1)\gamma'}\big(\tfrac{\sigma_0-\beta'}{\sigma_0-1}\big)^{c\log\gamma'} = \tfrac{A\ W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^\tau}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where $A = \frac{9\ (\sigma-1)2^{\sigma-1}}{2(2^{\sigma-1}-1)}$ and τ being defined in (2.12), recalling the designation of σ_0 in (2.3).

4. ESTIMATES ON SUMS

In this section, we estimate the sum

$$S = S_0 - S_1 - S_2 - S_3, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$S_j = \sum_{\rho \in \mathbf{H}_j} W^{\rho-\rho'} \Big(\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-\rho}\Big)^k, \tag{4.2}$$

for $j = 0,\ 1,\ 2,\ 3$. Here, $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{Z}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{H}_1 = \big\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z}:\ |\gamma-\gamma'| \geq x\big\}, \\ &\mathbf{H}_2 = \big\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z}:\ u(\sigma_0-\beta') < |\gamma-\gamma'| < x\big\}, \\ &\mathbf{H}_3 = \big\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z}:\ |\gamma-\gamma'| \leq u(\sigma_0-\beta') \textit{ and } \beta \leq 1-y(\sigma_0-\beta')\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Note that $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{H}_1 \cup \mathbf{H}_2 \cup \mathbf{H}_3$ with the union being disjoint so (4.1) is justified.

To estimate S_0, we recall (2.3) and (2.6). It follows that

$$\left|W^{1-\rho'}\left(\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-1}\right)^k\right| \lhd W^{1-\beta'}\left(\frac{\sigma_0-\beta'}{\sigma_0-1}\right)^k = \frac{W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\tau'}}, \tag{4.4}$$

where τ' is defined in (2.12). We also have

$$\left|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} W^{-2n-\rho'}\left(\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0+2n}\right)^k\right| \le \frac{1}{W^2}\left(\frac{a(1-\beta')}{\gamma'}\right)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^{k-1}} \le \frac{W^{1-\beta'}}{\gamma'}, \tag{4.5}$$

?? (should be okay) noting that $k \ge 4$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^{k-2}} \le 1+\int_1^{\infty}\frac{1}{x^{k-2}}\,\mathrm{d}\,x = 1+\frac{1}{k-3} \le 2$ and $\gamma' \ge 2$ and $W \ge 1621$. With (3.13), (4.4), and (4.5), we get

$$|S_0| \le \frac{B\,W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\tau_0}}, \tag{4.6}$$

where B =?? and $\tau_0 = \min\{\tau, \tau', 1\}$ with τ and τ' being defined in (2.12).

For the estimate of S_1, we divide it into two subsums. One is over the set $\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z} : \gamma \ge ??\gamma' + c\}$; another over the set $\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z} : \gamma \le \gamma' - c\}$. One may estimate both subsums similarly with the same upper bound, therefore, we only give the details for the first one.

Recall from [13] that

$$\left|N(T) - M(T) + \tfrac{7}{8}\right| \le Q(T)\,, \tag{4.7}$$

where $M(T) = \frac{T}{2\pi}\log\frac{T}{2\pi} - \frac{T}{2\pi}$ and $Q(T) = 0.137\log T + 0.443\log\log T + 1.588$. From this formula, we derive

$$N(t+d) - N(t-d) \le M(t+d) - M(t-d) + Q(t+d) + Q(t-d).$$

We use the mean-value theorem to get

$$M(t+d) - M(t-d) \le \frac{d}{\pi}\left(\log\frac{t+d}{2\pi} + 2\pi + 1\right).$$

Therefore, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $\gamma'' \ge 16$. *Then,*

$$\sum_{\rho\in\mathbf{Z}:\ |\gamma-\gamma''|\le d} 1 \le \frac{7d}{22}\log\gamma''. \tag{4.8}$$

By this lemma, one sees that the number of zeros $\zeta(s)$ for $\gamma' + n \leq \gamma \leq \gamma' + n + 1$ is not greater than $\frac{7}{22}\log(\gamma' + n)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_1| &\leq 2W^{1-\beta'} \sum_{\rho \in \mathbf{Z}:\ \gamma - \gamma' \geq x} \left(\frac{\sigma_0 - \beta'}{|s_0 - \rho|} \right)^k \\ &\leq \frac{7}{11} W^{1-\beta'} \sum_{n = \lfloor x \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right)^k \log(\gamma' + n). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\log(\gamma' + n) = \log\gamma' + \log\bigl(1 + \tfrac{n}{\gamma'}\bigr) \leq \log\gamma' \log n,$$

$\log n \leq n$, and $\sum_{n=\lfloor x \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{k-1}} \leq \int_{\lfloor x \rfloor}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^{k-1}}\,\mathrm{d}\,x \leq \frac{1}{(k-2)x^{k-2}}$. It follows that

$$|S_1| \leq \tfrac{7}{11}\, W^{1-\beta'} 2^k \log\gamma' \sum_{n = \lfloor x \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{k-1}} \leq \frac{E\, W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\tau_1}}, \tag{4.9}$$

where $C = \frac{14}{11\,b}$ and τ_1 is defined in (2.12). As for estimate of S_2, we recall the definition of $\mathbf{H}_2$ in (4.3) and using (4.8) with $d = x - u(\sigma - \beta')$ and $\gamma' \geq ???$ again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |S_2| &\leq 78??W^{1-\beta'} \log(\gamma' + x) \left(\frac{\sigma_0 - \beta'}{\sqrt{(\sigma_0 - 1)^2 + u(\sigma_0 - \beta')^2}} \right)^k \\ &\leq 899??W^{1-\beta'} \log\gamma' \left(\frac{a}{a - 1 + ua} \right)^k \leq 99??\frac{W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\tau_2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where τ_2 is defined in (2.12) and $\tau^{(0)}$ whereafter, noting $\log\gamma' \leq (\gamma')^{\tau^{(0)}}$ for $\gamma' \geq T_0$. Similarly, we get

$$S_3 \lhd 7?2W^{1-\beta'} \log\gamma' \left(\frac{\sigma_0 - \beta'}{y(\sigma_0 - \beta')} \right)^k = \frac{72W^{1-\beta'}}{(\gamma')^{\tau_3}}, \tag{4.11}$$

noting that $\sigma_0 - \beta > 1 - \beta \geq y(\sigma_0 - \beta')$ from (2.3) and $\beta \leq 1 - y(\sigma_0 - \beta')$ in the definition of $\mathbf{H}_3$ in (4.3).

We finish the proof of (2.9) by collecting (4.6), (4.9), (4.10), and (4.11).

5. Applying the power sum method lemmas

Turán invented the power sum method while investigating the zeta function and he first used the method to prove results about the zeros of the zeta function. Using his power sum method, Turán proved the following two lemmas in [16].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $L \in \mathbb{N}+1$ and z_1, z_2, $\ldots$, z_L be complex numbers with*

$$\min_{1\le l\le L} |z_l| \ge M. \tag{5.1}$$

Then for all $D \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $D \ge 1$,

$$\max_{D\le\nu\le D+L} \left| z_1^\nu + z_2^\nu + \ldots + z_L^\nu \right| > M^D \left(\frac{M\,L}{e(M+1)(D+L)} \right)^L. \tag{5.2}$$

The next lemma is a slightly revised version, with less restriction on D and improved constant in the lower bound, of Lemma III on page 49 in [16]. We shall prove Lemma 5.2 in Section 6, involving using the above lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $L \in \mathbb{N}+1$, $l = 1, 2, \ldots, L$, and $z_l \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy the condition*

$$\max_{1\le l\le L} |z_l| \ge 1. \tag{5.3}$$

Then for every $D \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $D \ge \frac{L}{40}$,

$$\max_{D\le\nu\le D+L} \left| z_1^\nu + z_2^\nu + \ldots + z_L^\nu \right| \ge \left(\frac{L}{16e^2(D+L)} \right)^L. \tag{5.4}$$

We apply these two lemmas by letting L be the number of zeros $\zeta(s)$ in the region $\mathbf{H}$, one sees

$$L = |\mathbf{H}| \le \tfrac{21\,a\,(1-\beta')}{22}\ \log\gamma'. \tag{5.5}$$

Let l be a one-to-one map from $\mathbf{H}$ to $\{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$ such that $l = l(\rho)$ and denote

$$z_l = z_{l(\rho)} = e^{\omega(\rho-\rho')}\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-\rho}. \tag{5.6}$$

We have two cases.

Case (i). $\beta' > \delta$. We apply Lemma 5.2. The condition (5.3) is satisfied, noting that $z_{l(\rho')} = 1$. Note that $L \le \frac{21\,a\,(1-\delta)}{22}\log\gamma'$. The inequality (2.13) follows with κ being defined in (2.12).

Case (ii). $\frac{1}{2} < \beta' \le \delta$. We apply Lemma 5.1. Note that

$$\frac{s_0-\rho'}{s_0-\rho} \triangleright \frac{\sigma_0-\beta'}{\sqrt{(\sigma_0-1/2)^2+u^2(\sigma_0-\beta')^2}} \ge M'',$$

where M'' is defined in (2.15). The condition (5.1) with M being the value in the last expression is satisfied. Now, we have $L \le \frac{21\,a}{44}\log\gamma'$. The inequality (2.13) is validified with κ being defined in (2.12).

Finally, we take $\delta = \frac{17}{19}$. With this choice, we choose $a =$, $b =$, $c =$, $u =$, $x =$, $y =$, and $\lambda =$ to make (2.16) to be valid.

6. Proof of a power sum method lemma

In this section, we prove Lemma 5.2.

First of all, note that we may assume $M_0 = 1$, where $M_0 = \max_{1\le j\le L} |z_j|$ henceforth, without loss of generality. To justify this claim, we only need to apply the lemma with respect to the assumption that $M_0 = 1$ to the case in which $M_0 > 1$ and using z_j/M_0 in place of z_j for $j = 1$, 2, …, L.

Secondly, we may assume that D is an integer with M_1 being replaced by M_2, where $M_1 = \max_{D\le\nu\le D+L} |z_1^v + z_2^v + \ldots + z_L^v|$ and $M_2 = \max_{D+1\le\nu\le D+L}$
$|z_1^v + z_2^v + \ldots + z_L^v|$ from now on. One may justify that the lemma is valid for any $D \in \mathbb{R}^+$ by using the integer part $\lfloor D\rfloor$ in place of D and noting that $M_1 \ge M_2$.

We also may assume that z_j's for $1 \le j \le L$ are all distinct. Otherwise, we justify the lemma by constructing an infinite sequence of the list $[z_{1k}, z_{2k}, \ldots, z_{Lk}]$ with respect to all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the sequence converges to $[z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_L]$ and all z_{jk}'s are distinct for any fixed k and use $\lim_{k\to\infty} \max_{D+1\le\nu\le D+L} |z_{1k}^v + z_{2k}^v + \ldots + z_{Lk}^v|$, as in [17].

Therefore, we only need to prove the lemma under the assumption that z_j's are all distinct for $j = 1$, 2, …, L, $M_0 = 1$, and D is an integer with M_1 being replaced by M_2.

We first use a lemma in [14] from analytic theory of polynomials.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $w \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f(w) = \prod_{j=1}^{L}(w - z_j)$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then for any prescribed $U \in \mathbb{R}^+$ the inequality $|f(w) \ge U^L$ holds outside at most L discs $|w - z_j| \le r_j$ such that $r_1 + r_2 + \ldots + r_L \le 2eU$.*

By Lemma 6.1, we have $|f(w)| \ge U^L$ on a circle $|w| = r$ such that

$$0 < U < \tfrac{1}{4e} \quad \textit{and} \quad 0 < 1 - 4eU \le r. \tag{6.1}$$

From $|w - z_j| \le 2$ for every $j = 1$, 2, …, L, we see that

$$|w - z_{i_1}|\,|w - z_{i_2}| \cdots |w - z_{i_\lambda}| \ge \left(\tfrac{U}{2}\right)^L, \tag{6.2}$$

on $|w| = r$ for every choice of $\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_\lambda\}$ from $\{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$.

We choose $U = \frac{1}{4\,e\,(1+\lambda)}$ and rearrange the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$ so that we have two cases.

Case (I). $1 = |z_1| \ge |z_2| \ge \ldots \ge |z_L| > r$.

Here, we use Lemma 5.1 but with M_1 being replaced by M_2, which is valid when $D \in \mathbb{N}$ from [16]. With $M = 1 - 4eU$ in this lemma, one gets

$$M_2 \geq (1-4eU)^D \left(\frac{(1-4eU)L}{2e(1-2eU)(D+L)} \right)^L . \tag{6.3}$$

Noting that $\left(1+\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^\lambda \leq e$ and $\frac{1-4eU}{1-2eU} \geq \frac{1}{8e}$ for $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{40}$, we justify (5.4).

Case (II). $1 = |z_1| \geq |z_2| \geq \ldots \geq |z_l| > r > z_{l+1} \geq \ldots \geq z_L$, where $l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, L-1\}$. Let

$$P(w) = \prod_{j=l+1}^{L} (w - z_j) = \sum_{j=0}^{L-l} a_j \, w^{L-l-j}. \tag{6.4}$$

For the coefficients of the polynomial $P(w)$, we have

$$a_j = \sum_{l+1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \ldots < k_j \leq L} z_{k_1} z_{k_2} \cdots z_{k_j} \lhd \binom{L-l}{j}. \tag{6.5}$$

The following lemma is a classical result from the theory of Newton-interpolation, see page 48 in [16].

Lemma 6.2. *Let $w \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be a simple closed curve consisting of analytic arcs on the w-plane and $G(w)$ a regular function outside and on $\mathcal{C}$ so that $G(w) \to 0$ uniformly if $|w| \to \infty$. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, w_1, w_2, ..., w_l be different points outside $\mathcal{C}$, and $f(w)$ be a polynomial of degree $l-1$. If $g(w) = G(w)$ when $w = w_j$ for all $j = 1$, 2, ..., l, then*

$$g(w) = \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} b_j \prod_{k=1}^{j} (w - w_k), \tag{6.6}$$

with the coefficients

$$b_j = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{G(z)}{\prod_{k=1}^{j} (z - w_j)} \, \mathrm{d}\, z, \tag{6.7}$$

where the product $\prod_{k=1}^{0} (z - w_j)$ is considered to be 1.

Let $Q(w)$ be the polynomial of degree $l-1$ such that $Q(z_j) = \frac{1}{z_j^{D+1} P(z_j)}$ for every $j = 1$, 2, ..., l. Then, by Lemma 6.2, we have

$$Q(w) = \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} b_j \prod_{k=1}^{j} (w - z_k) = \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} c_j w^j, \tag{6.8}$$

with

$$b_j = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=r} \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{z^{D+1} P(z) \prod_{k=1}^{j} (z - z_k)}, \tag{6.9}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1$. From this, one gets

$$|b_j| \le \frac{1}{r^D}\left(\frac{2}{U}\right)^L \le \frac{1}{(1-4eD)^D}\left(\frac{2}{U}\right)^L, \tag{6.10}$$

recalling (6.2). Expressing c_j in terms of b_j in (6.8) by the above lemma, we see

$$\begin{aligned} c_j = b_j - b_{j+1} \sum_{1\le i_1\le j+1} z_{i_1} + b_{j+2} \sum_{1\le i_1,i_2\le j+1} z_{i_1}z_{i_2} - \ldots \\ + (-1)^{l-j-1} b_{l-1} \sum_{1\le i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_{l-j-1}\le j+1} z_{i_1}z_{i_2}\cdots z_{i_{l-j-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-2$ and $c_{l-1} = b_{l-1}$. By this inequality and (6.10), we acquire

$$|c_j| \le \binom{l}{j+1}\frac{1}{(1-4eD)^D}\left(\frac{2}{U}\right)^L \tag{6.12}$$

recalling $|z_j| \le 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-2$ and noting that $1 + \binom{j+1}{1} + \binom{j+2}{2} + \ldots + \binom{l-1}{l-j-1} = \binom{l}{j+1}$.

Finally we let

$$R(w) = w^{D+1}P(w)Q(w) = \sum_{j=D+1}^{D+L} d_j\, w^j. \tag{6.13}$$

It follows from the definition of $P(w)$ and $Q(w)$ and $z_j \ne z_k$ for $j \ne k$ that $R(z_j) = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, l$ and $R(z_j) = 0$ for $j = l+1, l+2, \ldots, L$. Replacing 1 by $R(z_j)$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, l$ in (6.13) and adding the results together, one gets

$$M_2 \sum_{j=D+1}^{D+L} |d_j| \ge 1. \tag{6.14}$$

By (6.13) with (6.12) and (6.5), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=D+1}^{D+L} |d_j| \le \left(\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} |c_j|\right)\left(\sum_{j=0}^{L-l} |a_j|\right) \le \frac{1}{(1-4eU)^D}\left(\frac{4}{U}\right)^L, \tag{6.15}$$

from which and (6.14), we conclude

$$M_2 \ge (1-4eU)^D\left(\frac{U}{4}\right)^L. \tag{6.16}$$

We conclude Lemma 5.2 in case (ii) similarly as in case (i); the lower bound is valid for any value of λ.

This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.2.

References

1. Cheng, Y. and Pomerance C., *On primes beyond the Riemann hypothesis*. In preparation, 2009.
2. Cheng, Y., *Proof of the density hypothesis*. Submitted to the Journal of American Mathematical Society, July 22, 2009.
3. Cheng, Y., *Proof of the Riemann hypothesis*. Submitted to Acta Arithmetica, August 16, 2009.
4. Cheng, Y., *An explicit zero-free region for the Riemann zeta function*, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics, **30** (2000), 135–148.
5. Davenport, H., *Multiplicative Number Theory*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 1980.
6. Gourdon, X., The 10^{13} first zeros of the Riemann Zeta function, and zeros computation at very large height, http://numbers.computation.free.fr/Constants/Mis- cellaneous/zetazeros1e13-1e24.pdf, 2004.
7. Ivić, A., *The Riemann zeta function – Theory and applications*, Mineola, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1985.
8. Lang, S., *Real and Functional Analysis*, 3rd. ed., Springer-Verlag, 1993.
9. Meller, N. A., *Computations connected with check of Riemann hypothesis*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, **123** (1958), pp. 246–248.
10. Odlyzko, A. M. and Schönhage, A., *Fast algorithms for multiple evaluations of the Riemann zeta function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **309** (2) (1988), pp. 797–809.
11. http://planetmath.org/encyclopedia/ValueOfTheRiemannZetaFunctionAtS0.html
12. Riemann, B., *Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter eine gegebener Grösse*, Monatsber. Akad., Berlin, pp. 671–680, 1859.
13. Schoenfeld, L., *Sharper Bounds for Chebyshev Functions $\theta(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ II*, Math. Comp., **30** (1976), pp. 337–360.
14. Rahman, Q. I., and Schmeisser G., *Analytic theory of polynomials*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
15. Turán, P. *On Riemann's hypothesis*, Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de l'URSS, Série Math., **11** (1947), pp. 197-262.
16. Turán, P. *On the remainder term of the prime number formula, II*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **1** (1950), pp. 155-166.
17. Turán, P. *On Carlson's theorem in the theory o f the zeta-function of Riemann*, Acta Math. Hung., No. 1-2, **2** (1951), pp. 39–73.

Drafted: July 21, 2009 – November 20, 2009.

Keywords: The distribution of the prime numbers, the Riemann zeta function, the remainder of the prime number theorem, and the zero-free region.

ANALYTIC IMPLICATIONS FROM THE REMAINDER TERM OF THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM

CHENG, YUAN-YOU FU-RUI

Abstract. It is well known that the distribution of the prime numbers plays a central role in number theory. It has been known, since Riemann's memoir in 1860, that the distribution of prime numbers can be described by the zero-free region of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$. This function has infinitely many zeros and a unique pole at $s = 1$. Those zeros at $s = -2, -4, -6, \dots$ are known as trivial zeros. The nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are all located in the so-called critical strip $0 < \Re(s) < 1$. Define $\Lambda(n) = \log p$ whenever $n = p^m$ for a prime number p and a positive integer m, and zero otherwise. Let $x \geq 2$. The ψ-form of the prime number theorem is $\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) = x + O\big(x^{1-H(x)} \log^2 x\big)$, where the sum runs through the set of positive integers and $H(x)$ is a certain function of x with $\frac{1}{2} \leq H(x) < 1$. Turán proved in 1950 that this ψ-form implies that there are no zeros of $\zeta(s)$ for $\Re(s) > h(t)$, where $t = \Im(s)$, and $h(t)$ is a function connected to $H(x)$ in a certain way with $1/2 \leq h(t) < 1$ but both $H(x)$ and $h(t)$ are close to 1. We prove results similar to Turán's where $\frac{1}{2} \leq H(x) < 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq h(t) < 1$ in altered forms without any other restrictions. The proof involves slightly revising and applying Turán's power sum method.

Department of Mathematics, University ??, Philadelphia, PA 191??
E-mail address: `Cheng, YuanYou FuRui (a.k.a. fred) <chengyf@math.????.edu>`

Department of Mathematics, University ???, .
E-mail address: `Fox, Glenn, <???@???.edu>`